

## **REMARKS**

The Official Action dated 26 July 2004 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith, Jr. (3,911,907).

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hwang (5,632,711).

Claims 1 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chuang (US 2004/0097337 A1).

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 6 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1. Claim 5 to which claim 6 is dependent thereon has also been deleted and has also been included into claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 8 are dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3.

Claim 7 has been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 8. Claim 10 is dependent on claim 9. Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10.

Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 7-11 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most

respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner NGUYEN are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.